

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS:

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10, and 11 have been pending.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3 and 11 have been cancelled without disclaimer and prejudice, and claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 10 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added by these amendments.

Thus claims 1, 4-6, 8, and 10 remain for reconsideration, which is requested. No new matter is added.

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS

The Office Action, on pages 2-3, objected to claim 1, 5, and 8 because of the informalities: grammar issues and missing words. By the foregoing amendments, these claims have been amended to correct the informalities: grammar issues and missing words.

The Office Action, on pages 2-3, objected to claim 1, 5, and 8 because of the informalities: confusing term. By the foregoing amendments, these claims have been amended to correct the informalities: confusing term.

Thus withdrawal of the objection of claims 1, 5, and 8 is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112 (2)

In item 7 on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 8, and 11, and by way of dependence 3, 4, 6, and 10, are rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness.

Claim 11 has been cancelled. Therefore the objection of Claim 11 is moot. Claim 1 has been amended clarifying the transmissions, taking into consideration the Examiner comments. Claims 5 and 8 have been similarly amended. Therefore it is submitted that claims 1, 3-6, 8, and 10 satisfy the requirements under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Thus withdrawal of these rejections of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, and 11 is respectfully requested.

In item 8 on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 10, are rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 for indefiniteness. Claim 10 has been amended to more

particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Thus withdrawal of this rejection of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Pat No. 6,807,539 to Miller et al. (hereinafter referred to as Miller) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,631,367 to Teng et al. (hereinafter referred to as Teng).

Claim 11 has been cancelled. Therefore the rejection of Claim 11 is moot.

Miller and Teng do not disclose, teach, or suggest the feature of “**recording a predetermined number of pieces of authentication information ... for each of said information retrieval sites ..., said predetermined number of pieces of authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said an information retrieval sites site to restrict number of accesses from said server to the information retrieval site**” and “**identifying, from among the predetermined number of pieces of authentication information assigned to the server by the target information retrieval site, a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes ...; transmitting, to said target information retrieval site, said unused piece of authentication information,**” as recited in claim 1. For example, the present application page 13, line 1 to page 14, line 4, and page 16, lines 3-11; and FIG. 2 support the claims. The embodiments provide a benefit of a retrieval site assigning a set of authentication information to the cross-site search server, for example, in FIG. 2, three pieces of authentication information, to control number of access by the cross-site search server to the retrieval site.

According to an aspect of an embodiment, the language of the claims provides the cross-site search server is “**generating a cross-site search process**” and identifies a piece of authentication information for a target retrieval site that is not in use by other search processes from the assigned set of authentication information by the target retrieval site (e.g., in FIG. 2, ‘login ID 10003’) to transmit the unused authentication information to the target retrieval site, namely “**identifying, from among the predetermined number of pieces of authentication information assigned to the server by the target information retrieval site, a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes,** ~~from among pieces of authentication information corresponding to said information retrieval site designated by said user terminal when said script definition read in said reading step defines the said~~

authentication function; ***transmitting, to said target information retrieval site, said unused piece of authentication information.***” See for example dependent claim 10 discussed below.

Claim 10 is allowable by further requiring “***waiting, when all of said predetermined number of pieces of authentication information assigned by said target information retrieval site are in use by other cross-site search processes, until a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes appears one of said other cross-site processes with an in use piece of authentication information stops using*** the in use piece of authentication information.”

It is readily apparent that nothing has been cited that expressly or implicitly disclosed these features. The Office Action relies upon Miller column 5, line 62 to column 6, line 48 and column 7, lines 21-31, and FIG. 6, however, Miller only discusses translator 16 submits login and authorization information in order to establish access to the database interface of the corresponding database 18. Further, Teng is relied upon for allegedly discussing a scenario in which authentication is unnecessary. Further, the Office Action Response to Arguments relies upon inherency by asserting authentication inherently or necessarily limits the number of accesses to only those with proper authentication information. However, the embodiments provide a benefit of a retrieval site limiting number of accesses by a server to the retrieval site by assigning a set of authentication information to the server, namely the language of the claims expressly provides “recording ***a predetermined number of pieces of authentication information*** into said storage ***for each of said information retrieval sites ...said predetermined number of pieces of authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said an information retrieval sites site to restrict number of accesses from said server to the information retrieval site.***” For example, in FIG. 2, three pieces of authentication information are assigned by a retrieval site to a server, and FIG. 2 illustrates that two of the authentication information are in use since the have process ID information (page 13, lines 14-16 of the present application).

The Office Action Response to Arguments relies upon Miller column 8, line 30 to column 9, line 26, which discuss the database 18 authenticating the translator 16, and the Office Action asserts that such authentication inherently shows management of the number of accesses. However, the language of the claims does not merely recite “management of the number accesses,” and a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established since nothing has been cited or found in Miller and Teng that expressly or implicitly discloses to one skilled in the art to

combine Miller's discussion of database 18 conventionally authenticating the translator 16 with Teng, which only discusses a search manager without mentioning authentication, and then further modify Miller and/or Teng to provide the language of the claims, namely "**recording a predetermined number of pieces of authentication information** ... for each of said information retrieval sites ..., **said predetermined number of pieces of authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said an information retrieval-sites site to restrict number of accesses from said server to the information retrieval site**" and "**identifying, from among predetermined number of the pieces of authentication information assigned to the server by the target information retrieval site, a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes ... transmitting, to said target information retrieval site, said unused piece of authentication information.**" In other words, Teng does not discuss authentication, so Teng cannot be supporting evidence for modifying Miller, because the claimed embodiments provide a benefit of identifying authentication information corresponding to the target retrieval site that is not in use and "**transmitting, to said target information retrieval site, said unused piece of authentication information.**" Further, it is readily apparent as discussed above, that Miller's authentication of translator 16 does not necessarily require (it is not inherent) and/or does not implicitly disclose to one skilled in the art the claimed "**predetermined number of pieces of authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said an information retrieval-sites site to restrict number of accesses from said server to the information retrieval site,**" and "**identifying, from among the predetermined number of pieces of authentication information assigned to the server by the target information retrieval site, a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes ...; transmitting, to said target information retrieval site, said unused piece of authentication information,**" in combination with the other claimed features.

Therefore, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Miller and Teng.

Independent claims 5 and 8 recite similar features of claim 1, and are allowable for similar reasons.

Dependent claims 4 and 6 necessarily include all of the features of their associated independent claim plus other additional features that do not recite Miller and Teng. For the same reason, claims 4 and 6 are patentably distinguishing over miller and Teng.

Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, and 11 under 35 USC. §103(a) is

respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding rejections, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: October 17, 2008

By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501